

REMARKS

The following remarks are responsive to the Office Action of August 6, 2008.

Summary of the Office Action

At the time of the Office Action, claims 1-12 were pending. The claims were rejected as follows:

- Claims **1–3 and 8–10** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by **Multer** et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,694,336) (hereinafter “Multer”);
- Claims **4, 5 and 11** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Multer** in view of **Ims** et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0091533) (hereinafter “Ims”).
- Claims **6, 7 and 12** stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over **Multer** in view of Microsoft Computer Dictionary 5th Edition (hereinafter “**Microsoft**”).

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Anticipation of Claims 1–3 and 8–10 by Multer

1. Multer does not disclose the feature “service portals, each hosting at least one personal information manager (PIM) service” in both former claim 1 and presently amended claim 1.

In Applicants’ previous response, regarding claim 1, Applicants asserted:

- a) Multer does not disclose that, among the connected devices shown in Fig. 7, there are provided service portals, each hosting at least one personal information manager (PIM) service. Fig. 7, and the corresponding passage in col. 7, lines 45-67, only mentions that the network 700 connects devices such as personal computers, cellular phones, web browser, etc., but does not mention that web portals with PIM service are connected thereto;
- b) Multer does not disclose that each of said portals is accessible by means of remote access terminals; and

- c) Multer does not disclose that the first synchronization means have a client-server architecture, where the client and server of this architecture respectively comprise a module hosted in one of the portals and, on the other hand, a module hosted within the other portal or within each of the other portals.

In the Office Action, on pp. 2–3, the Examiner described how the elements of Multer were being read on claim 1 of the present application.

Applicants have amended claim 1 and respond as follows:

- 1) Multer does not disclose the feature “service portals, each hosting at least one personal information manager (PIM) service” in both former claim 1 and presently amended claim 1.

In the Office Action, the Examiner only cites Fig. 7 of Multer as disclosing this feature. However, neither Fig. 7, nor any other passage of Multer discloses any service portal, or that a personal information manager (PIM) service is hosted in one of the devices connected by the network. Fig. 7 just discloses a network connecting different elements, such as a telephone, a home PC, a palm, a browser, or an Office PC, but none of them is a service portal, and none of them hosts a personal information manager (PIM) service. In the event that the Examiner is relying upon other parts of Multer for the disclosure related to the claimed service portal, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner point out with particularity the passage in Multer where this could be found.

2. Multer does not disclose the features “(...) a synchronization client module, hosted in a first of said service portals” and “a synchronization server module, hosted within at least the second of said server portals” in amended claim 1.

In the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, the Examiner just cited Multer’s “storage 300” as reading on the claimed first feature, and “synchronization receiver 60-910” as reading on the second feature. However, such devices are not hosted in any service portals, and therefore cannot be used to disclose these features.

3. *Multer does not disclose the feature “the first data synchronization means are adapted to establish a correspondence between the data stored in the portals” as claimed in claim 1.*

The only disclosure of Multer identified as reading on this feature by the Examiner consists of the statement “difference means 602-608”. The only occurrence concerning these difference means 602-608 in the whole Multer document is found in column 7, lines 45-67. This passage however does not disclose that the first data synchronization means are adapted to establish a correspondence between the data stored in the portals.

Should the Examiner be aware of such a disclosure in other parts of Multer, Applicants respectfully request that such a disclosure be specifically pointed to in the next response.

4. *Multer does not disclose the feature “the first synchronization means includes a client-server architecture, the client of said architecture comprising a synchronization client module, hosted in a first of said service portals and communicating with a first server implementing the personal information manager service of said first service portal, and the server of said architecture comprising a synchronization server module, hosted within at least the other the second of said service portals and communicating with a second server hosting a different the personal information manager service of said second service portal, said modules communicating via a computer network.”*

First of all, the passages of Multer cited by the Examiner (col. 6, 1. 33-67; col. 7, 1. 45- 67; “storage 300”; “transmitter 602-608”; “synchronization receiver 60-910” (?); “network 700”) fail to disclose that the first synchronization means includes a client-server architecture. Against that feature in particular, the Examiner has merely stated “transmitter 602-608”. Such a statement does not disclose any kind of client-server architecture.

Moreover, from this amended feature, Applicants now clearly emphasize that:

- the client of the client-server architecture comprises a synchronization client module hosted in a first of said service portals and communicating with a first server implementing the personal information manager service of said first portal, and that

- the server of the client-server architecture comprises a synchronization server module hosted within at least the second of said service portals and communicating with a second server hosting the personal information manager service of said second service portal.

Again, however, the Examiner has just cited “storage 300” against the first above-mentioned feature. However, there is no indication in the cited passages that the storage means 300 are communicating with a first server hosting personal information manager service of a first portal. Multer does not disclose as well that the storage 300 is a synchronization client module.

Similarly, the Examiner has simply cited “synchronization receiver 60-910” against the second above-mentioned feature. The Applicants could not find these references in the cited passages or in the figures of Multer. Such a citation does not disclose that there is a communication with a second server hosting personal information manager service of a second service portal, different from the first one. Multer does not disclose as well that the so-called synchronization receiver would be a synchronization server module. Should the Examiner be aware of another disclosure of these features in other parts of Multer than the ones he has already cited, Applicants respectfully request that he specifically point out the passages in Multer where this could be found.

Independent claims 8 and 10 have been amended in a similar manner to claim 1, and therefore, the above-mentioned arguments regarding claim 1 apply to claims 8 and 10 as well.

In addition, in the Examiner’s rejection of claim 1, the Examiner relies on two different passages of Multer, respectively col. 6, 1. 33-67 and col. 7, 1. 45-67. These two different passages relate to different embodiments (figs. 3 and 4, respectively. fig. 7), as indicated by their introduction (“Fig. 3 (resp. 7) shows yet another alternative embodiment”). The first passage (col. 6, lines 33-67) refers to two embodiments (figs. 3 and 4) where a single storage server is shown, whereas in amended claim 1, first and second servers, each hosting different PIM services, are claimed. For this reason, this first passage cannot be considered as anticipating amended claim 1, where the number of servers is different.

Moreover, not only must the claimed elements be found in a single reference in order for the reference to anticipate a claim, but the claimed relationships between the references must be

found as well. The Examiner has selectively chosen the respective teachings of different passages each referencing different embodiments in Multer, but has not demonstrated that the claimed relationships between those elements are present.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited prior art documents teach all the features of amended claims 1, 8 or 10. The prior art relied on fails to provide any suggestion for one skilled in the art to adapt the teaching of these documents so as to obviate the claimed invention. Claims 2, 3, and 9 are not anticipated by Multer by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 and 8 respectively.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Obviousness of Claims 4–7 and 11–12 over Multer in view of Ims and Microsoft

5. Applicants rely upon the above arguments with respect to the remaining dependent claims, and assert that none of the additional references supplants the deficiencies identified above with respect to Multer.

In the Office Action, on pp. 5–17, the Examiner combined Multer with Ims and Microsoft in establishing an obviating combination of references for various dependent claims in the present application. Without addressing the specifics of the additional references on the merits, Applicants rely upon the above arguments and assert that the disclosures of each of these additional references, alone or in combination, do not serve to solve the deficiencies of the Multer reference. The Examiner has cited these references for purposes related to the specifics of the dependent claims.

For these reasons, the Applicants assert that the claim language clearly distinguishes over the prior art, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection from the present application.

In re Appln. of Le Lann et al.
Application No. 10/544,289
Response to Final Office Action of December 9, 2008

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/brian c. rupp/

Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665
Mark Bergner, Reg. No. 45,877
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 3700
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)
Customer No.: 08968

Date: February 9, 2009

CH01/ 25299863.1